

REMARKS

Claims 14-27 are now pending in the above-referenced application.

Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner has allowed claims 14, 17, 18 and 22-26.

As for the non-enablement rejection of claims 15, 16, and 27, the Examiner does nothing more than quote the offending limitations in question and declare them to be undefined or ask some question about them. With respect, these bald-faced assertions fall well below the standard for establishing a prima facie case of non-enablement. As the Examiner surely knows, the Examiner must present an argument, based on scientific reason, that demonstrates why one of ordinary skill in the art could not practice the claimed invention without undue experimentation. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

As for the rejection based on indefiniteness, Applicants submit that it has been obviated by the amendments to claims 20 and 27.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the objections and rejections be withdrawn, and that the present application issue as early as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

By: LS (Reg. No. 41,770)

By

Gerard A. Messina
(Reg. No. 35,952)

One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

Dated: 11/30/06